originally named in the 19th or early 20th centuries. Often authors conclude that a newly-collected specimen, which can be fully described and preserved, cannot be distinguished from a previously illustrated, but inadequately described, type. Such studies provide a basis for valuable neotypification to stabilise the nomenclature for future work.

However, very often the newly described specimens were not collected in the same location as the originally named organism. By strict application of Article 75.3.6 of the Code, the newly described specimen cannot be regarded as a neotype because it was found in a different locality from the original type. Many, indeed probably most, protozoa are cosmopolitan, and are also very patchily distributed according to their microhabitat requirements. These microhabitats are usually transient, so that the species may have become extinct in the type location long ago, but may be abundant in other places where the conditions now suit them. Therefore, to insist that neotype material of protozoa must be obtained from the locality of original discovery may be unrealistic, or even impossible. The same probably applies to microscopic organisms of other groups occupying similar ecological niches. If this locality restriction is formally waived in the case of protozoa, then more of the taxonomists working with protozoa will be encouraged to deposit useful neotype material of the species they study in suitable type collections. In addition, journal editors will be in a position to encourage, or insist on, such deposition.

(2) Inácio Domingos da Silva Neto
Instituto de Biologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

I support Wilhelm Foissner's proposal that the neotypes of protists, especially Ciliates, should be freed from the type locality regulation of Article 75.3.6 of the Code.

(3) Jerzy Sikora
Department of Cell Biology, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa, Poland

Wilhelm Foissner presents a convincing argument concerning the neotypication of protists. As Editor of *Acta Protozoologica*, I am interested in clarification of nomenclatural problems. Not being a specialist in systematics and taxonomy, I rely on Dr. Foissner's opinion and expertise. He undoubtedly enjoys the respect of people dealing with protists, especially heterotrophic ciliates. Therefore I consider his appeal to the Commission concerning waiving Article 75.3.6 of the Code to be a reasonable and valuable initiative.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of *Acmaeodera* Eschscholtz, 1829 and *Acmaeoderella* Cobos, 1955 (Insecta, Coleoptera) by designation of *Buprestis cylindrica* Fabricius, 1775 as the type species of *Acmaeodera*
(Case 3258; see BZN **60**: 31–33)

(1) Vladimir Sakalian
Institute of Zoology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1 Tzar Osvoboditel Blvd., 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria

I support this application, because it will ensure stability by conserving the current usage by all contemporary authors of these generic names.

(2) Ted C. MacRae

Monsanto, 700 Chesterfield Parkway West, Chesterfield, Mo 63017, U.S.A.

I support this application, because adherence to priority would require massive and unjustified nomenclatural rearrangement.

(3) Svatopluk Bílý

Department of Entomology, National Museum, Prague, Czech Republic

I support this application, because it is the right approach to maintaining nomenclatural stability in this group of beetles.

(4) Allen Sundholm

96 Turrella Street, Turrella 2205, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia

I support this application, in the interests of stability.

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Ovula gisortiana* Passy, 1859 over *Cypraea coombii* J. de C. Sowerby in Dixon, 1850.

(Case 3220; see BZN **59**: 173–175)

J.A. Todd

Department of Palaeontology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I write in opposition to the proposal to give precedence to *Gisortia gisortiana* (Passy, 1859) over *G. coombii* (J. de C. Sowerby in Dixon, 1850) should they be considered to be synonymous.

Since Schilder's redescription of *Gisortia coombii* (J. de C. Sowerby in Dixon, 1850) in 1929 from five specimens (one of which he subsequently (Schilder, 1930, p. 128) correctly recognized as a probable French specimen referable to *G. tuberculosa* (Duclos)), only four additional specimens of this species have found their way into the Natural History Museum collections in London. I know of no other specimens elsewhere in public museums. Through examination, I have been able to precisely localize all of these specimens in a modern stratigraphical context. Labels on recently collected material, combined with the preservation, matrix and contained fossils in the material Schilder examined, indicate that this species has been collected from only a thin stratigraphical interval (units E2ii to E4) of the Earnley Formation (previously part of the Lower Bracklesham Beds) of early Lutetian age from Bracklesham Bay, West Sussex (see Curry et al., 1978). This is despite these highly fossiliferous foreshore rock exposures being regularly exposed and collected from by many persons over at least the past 25 years. *Gisortia coombii* is